



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/848,764	05/04/2001	Sakae Ishikawa	207187US2	7828

22850 7590 05/31/2005

OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.
1940 DUKE STREET
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER

BUTLER, MICHAEL E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3653

DATE MAILED: 05/31/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/848,764

Applicant(s)

ISHAKAWA

Examiner

Michael Butler

Art Unit

3653

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 February 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-10, and 12-71 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 12-71 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 02.17.2005 & 03.23.2005
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

1. Applicant's claims of priority to Japanese applications: 2001-47288 filed 2/22/01; 2000-356640 filed 11/22/00; 2000-135235 filed 5/18/00. The certified copies of the documents have been received.

Election/Restriction

2. Applicant's election of invention I without traverse in Paper No. 12 was acknowledged and made final. Applicant's election of Species I with traverse in Paper No. 12 is acknowledged and the species requirement is made final. Applicant identified claims 1-11 as reading on the elected species.

MPEP § 816 relates to patentably distinct inventions, not species.

Applicant asserts no mutually exclusive species have been identified:

Applicant per MPEP § 806.04(f), there was no identification of mutually exclusive species. Same time and different time are clearly mutually exclusive times. Same location and different locations are clearly mutually exclusive. Same type product and differing type product are mutually exclusive products.

Applicant argues there would be no undue burden to all claimed species. However, burden is a restriction requirement element, not a species requirement element.

IDS

3. The translations of the cited Japanese language documents have been considered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

- (a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.
- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States
- (e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

5. Claims 1-2 and 5-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Knudsen, Jr. which discloses:

(Re: cl 1) A specification unit 25 configured to specify a plurality of first rack components required to assemble rack and those not required for first rack yet required for second rack (c9 L 29-c10 L 13; c4 L 14-30);
Instruction unit configured to provide delivery procedure for second article (c12 L 6-45);

(Re: cl 2) pallet with top and plurality of supports or shock absorbers (c5 L 1-29)

(Re: cl 7) third rack (c8 L 18-34)

(Re: cl 5) instruction unit includes confirmation unit; rack collection center (c10 L 58-67)

(Re: cl 6) if confirmed no stocking of second rack component at rack collection center instruction unit instructs management center to deliver rack (c7 L 41-c8 L 43)

(Re: cl 8) instruction unit includes first and second instruction units (c7 L 41-c8 L 17; 25/33).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having

Art Unit: 3653

ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Knudsen, Jr. in view of Otsuka et al. wherein Knudsen, Jr. discloses the elements previously discussed and Otsuka et al. discloses:

(Re: cl 3) system sales use warehouse; rack assembled with components production site (c5 L 1-35)

(Re: cl4) instruction unit instructs management center to deliver rack (c5 L 1-35).

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to move production task completed articles to storage warehouse to have them out of the way till ready for further work or shipment as taught by Otsuka et al..

8. Claims 1-2 and 4-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Knudsen, Jr. wherein Knudsen, Jr. discloses the elements previously discussed.

The examiner takes official notice that it is well known to transport computer systems together including image forming apparatus such as computer systems with printers with monitors and memory storage devices. It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to transport permutations of printers, monitors, and computer together on a rack as these components are regularly used and sold together and there common transfer would help users get the components together and come up with the instant inventions.

9. Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Knudsen, Jr. in view of Aria et al. '055 (JP11-348055A) wherein Knudsen, Jr. discloses

Art Unit: 3653

the elements previously discussed and Aria et al. '055 discloses any elements not inherently taught by Knudsen, Jr. including:

(Re: cl 3) system sales use warehouse; rack assembled with components production site (§ 2)

(Re: cl4) instruction unit instructs management center to deliver rack (§ 4);

(Re: cl 9) both first article and second article are image formation devices (§ 111)

(Re: cl 10) first article is an image formation device, and said second article is any device other than said image formation device (§ 111).

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to move production task completed articles to storage warehouse to have them out of the way till ready for further work or shipment as taught by Aria et al. '055 and come up with the instant invention. It would have been obvious at the time of the invention for Knudsen, Jr. to transport permutations of printers, monitors, and computer together on a rack as taught by Arai et al. '055 as these components are regularly used and sold together and there common transfer would help users get the components together and come up with the instant inventions.

Response to Amendments/Arguments

10. The applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are unpersuasive in overcoming the rejections.

Knudson, Jr. has items specified for the order for assembly in the rack. The automated product handling system of Knudsen, Jr. clearly specifies a picking of the selected components of the order. There is not a claim limitation for common components in both a first rack and a second rack.

Conclusion

11. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action. Applicant's submission of an information disclosure statement under 37 CFR 1.97(c) with the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(p) on 2/17/2005. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** See MPEP § 609(B)(2)(i). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

12. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Of particular interest is the Thompson reference which discloses an Internet accessible fuel pump terminal.

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Exmr. Michael E. Butler whose telephone number is (571) 272-6937.


Art Unit: 3653

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Donald Walsh, can be reached on (571) 272-6944. The fax number for the Group is (703) 305-7687.

Michael E. Butler

Michael E. Butler

Examiner


DONALD F. WALSH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600